



# EUI Working Papers

LAW 2012/12

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

THE EUI GOES EAST: PERSPECTIVES FOR RESEARCH ON  
CENTRAL, EASTERN AND SOUTH EASTERN EUROPE

Boško Tripković



**EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE, FLORENCE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF LAW**

***The EUI Goes East:***  
***Perspectives for Research on Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe***

**BOŠKO TRIPKOVIĆ**

This text may be downloaded for personal research purposes only. Any additional reproduction for other purposes, whether in hard copy or electronically, requires the consent of the author(s), editor(s). If cited or quoted, reference should be made to the full name of the author(s), editor(s), the title, the working paper or other series, the year, and the publisher.

ISSN 1725-6739

© 2012 Boško Tripković

Printed in Italy  
European University Institute  
Badia Fiesolana  
I – 50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)  
Italy  
[www.eui.eu](http://www.eui.eu)  
[cadmus.eui.eu](http://cadmus.eui.eu)

**Abstract**

The paper examines the capacities for research on Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe (CEE/SEE) at the EUI. It consists of two layers of inquiry. The first part presents the subject-field analysis of research related to the CEE/SEE that is currently undertaken at the EUI; the second part investigates the geographical coverage of the region at the EUI both in terms of researchers' origin and geographical focus of their research. The paper concludes by offering recommendations on how to enhance the research on CEE/SEE using the existing potentials.

**Keywords**

Central Europe, Eastern Europe, South Eastern Europe, Research

**Author Contact Details**

Boško Tripković,  
Department of Law,  
European University Institute,  
Via Giovanni Boccaccio 121,  
50133 Firenze,  
Italy

E-mail: [bosko.tripkovic@eui.eu](mailto:bosko.tripkovic@eui.eu)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Goals and Method .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Subject-Matter (Substantive) Analysis.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Department of Law (LAW) .....	5
Department of Economics (ECO) .....	6
Department of Political and Social Sciences (SPS) .....	6
Department of History and Civilization (HEC).....	8
Possibilities for Inter-Departmental Cooperation.....	9
Potentials for Cooperation within the ‘Core Group’ of Researchers.....	11
<b>Geographical Analysis .....</b>	<b>13</b>
Geographical Analysis According to Origin .....	13
Geographical Analysis According to the Focus of Research .....	21
<b>Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>27</b>





## **THE EUI GOES EAST: PERSPECTIVES FOR RESEARCH ON CENTRAL, EASTERN AND SOUTH EASTERN EUROPE**

### **Executive Summary**

This working paper is based on the report that came about as a consequence of the initiative of several researchers to mainstream the research on CEE/SEE countries at the EUI. After a number of talks the initiative gained the support of several EUI professors who agreed that this report should be prepared in order to assess the potentials of EUI researchers to deal with issues related to the CEE/SEE region. The purpose of the report is to identify human resources and detect strengths, weaknesses and capability to deal with issues pertaining to CEE/SEE, in each of the EUI's departments and on the level of the EUI as a whole. The report contains data accurate at the time of writing (September 2011).

The report consists of two parts. The first part deals with the subject-field analysis of research that is currently undertaken at the EUI that is at the same time related to the CEE/SEE region; the second part investigates geographical coverage of the region at the EUI both in terms of researchers' origin and geographical focus of their research. There are 91 researchers altogether that were approached and asked to provide a short abstract of their thesis. They are either originating from the region or conducting research on the region. At the same time, they are in their second, third or fourth year of PhD studies. A group of 22 researchers responded and expressed their immediate interest in the initiative, and they are referred to in the report as 'the core group'.

Subject field analysis has shown that there are considerable differences between departments with regard to the number of researchers dealing with the region in their PhD projects. Whereas LAW and ECO departments lag behind, there is a considerable amount of research on CEE/SEE done in the SPS and HEC departments. There are several possible common points of interest for researchers coming from different departments, but the report suggests that economic transformation or institutional change have the best chance to attract the widest possible range of researchers, while keeping at the same time the necessary level of specificity needed for raising the interest in the initiative. Economic transformation in CEE/SEE is a broad topic within which the relationship between free-market and welfare state values currently attract most attention. Institutional change could also serve as a subject field of research when put into the perspective of European integration; however, it is doubtful whether it would be of interest for ECO researchers. The core group of researchers could serve as a nucleus for future broader interdepartmental cooperation in these subject fields.

Geographical analysis has revealed that even though there is a great variety of researchers from CEE/SEE at the EUI, some countries and regions are still not represented (Moldova, Albania, Kosovo, Slovakia and Czech Republic). In almost all departments most of CEE/SEE researchers come from Poland. Important geographical clusters of researchers come from former USSR, former Yugoslavia, Turkey and Poland. Within the core group, only researchers from former Yugoslavia and Poland have expressed significant interest in the initiative at this point.

There are considerable differences between departments when geographical focus of their research is in question. LAW and ECO researchers rarely use CEE/SEE countries as case studies. In the SPS department research is most often done on former Yugoslav countries, and in the HEC department this is the case with former USSR. Among the core group of researchers there is potential for research on former Yugoslavia.

Finally, in the conclusion some recommendations are put forward: 1) there is a potential for research on economic transformation and institutional change; 2) there is a potential for research on former

Yugoslav countries; 3) for the success of the initiative it is crucial to establish cooperation between researchers interested in research on CEE/SEE, either through a working group or a workshop; 4) there is a need for institutionalization of the initiative; 5) in the long run the success of the initiative depends on external partnerships and cooperation through involvement of experts or institutions outside of the EUI.

## **Introduction**

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the existing resources and expertise at the European University Institute regarding the region of Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe (CEE/SEE).<sup>1</sup> The report comes as a consequence of several initiatives launched by EUI researchers throughout the academic year of 2010/2011. These initiatives aimed at mainstreaming the research on the CEE/SEE region at the EUI and had several interconnected goals: first, to increase the profile and presence of the EUI in the CEE/SEE region; second, to develop a stable network of people affiliated with the EUI that share a professional interest in CEE/SEE; and third, to enhance the existing resources and expertise at the EUI regarding the CEE/SEE region.

As a consequence of these initiatives several meetings took place in spring 2011 that included both researchers and professors that share a common interest in the region. During the meetings a number of ideas, strategies and proposals were put forward on how to proceed. Furthermore, researcher-led initiative gained generous support of several EUI professors, most notably Hans-Wolfgang Micklitz (LAW), László Bruszt (SPS) and Pavel Kolář (HEC). In addition, in a separate series of talks, professor Richard Rose (Director of the Centre for Study of Public Policy, University of Aberdeen) expressed his interest in the initiative and agreed to participate in future activities. Several other professors also indicated their willingness to take part in the initiative which has been unofficially named by professor Micklitz 'EUI Goes East' (EGE).

Finally, a group of researchers, fellows and professors met on 8th April 2011 to discuss how to proceed with EGE. The prevailing tenor of the meeting was that the EGE activities should be based on solid grounds, especially in terms of evaluating strengths and weaknesses that exist at the EUI when it comes to the expertise on CEE/SEE countries. Therefore, it was a common conclusion that we first need to undertake 'stocktaking' within the EUI to see which resources are available and how can they be used for the EGE.

Whereas the internal stocktaking process would pin down the existing resources, once the process is finished, there will be a need to look beyond the EUI to seek for possible fields of research that have been neglected at the EUI, burning issues in which the EUI community lacks expertise and, if needed, possible allies or cooperators outside of the EUI.

Hence, the process of initial screening has two phases - internal and external.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of the report, CEE/SEE will be taken to include the following countries: Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Albania, Romania, Bulgaria, Turkey and all former USSR republics. Without prejudice towards its status, for the purposes of this report Kosovo has been counted separately, especially because of its specific historical, ethnic and cultural background which may be relevant for some parts of the report. Thus, the disclaimer used for international representation of Kosovo applies to this report as well: 'This label [i.e. 'Kosovo'] does not prejudge the status of Kosovo and is in accordance with Resolution 1244 and the opinion of the ICJ on Kosovo's declaration of independence.'

1) The internal phase of initial screening process looks into the existing resources at the EUI with regard to the CEE/SEE region. It has two goals:

- i. detecting strengths and weaknesses in terms of research fields that are covered;
- ii. identifying human resources.

Therefore, a two-track process follows the diverging goals of the internal phase. Firstly, a research should be conducted to detect what is current state of expertise at the EUI with regard to CEE/SEE countries. The present report serves as a part of this assessment. Secondly, there should be a workshop that will attract motivated researchers. It should be peer reviewed, if possible by people outside of the EUI. In this way, it would be possible to identify the most able and motivated researchers that could subsequently be included in further project activities. The workshop will at the same time strengthen or challenge the conclusions related to research resources at the EUI.

2) The external phase of the screening process will be focused on identification of current burning issues of Europeanization processes and comparing these with the conclusions reached in the internal phase. This will be done through literature review and an on-line survey of stakeholders in the field which come from academia, politics or civil society. The external phase would serve as a benchmark for the expertise existing at the EUI.

In this way, the screening process will be conducted bottom-up both at the EUI level and beyond, while the initial contacts and visibility of the EGE will be built at the same time. After internal and external phase, it would be possible to enter a well informed and objectively grounded project-writing phase. Furthermore, this way of starting the project will create a critical mass of EUI researchers, fellows and professors interested in the project, so it would gain legitimacy necessary for its stable operation under the umbrella of the EUI.

The financial support for preparing this report has kindly been provided by Professor Hans-Wolfgang Micklitz.

## **Goals and Method**

The report serves as an assessment of the current state of affairs regarding the researchers' expertise on CEE/SEE region. It is divided into two sections: first part deals with the substantive (subject-matter) analysis of research projects currently under way at the EUI, and explores possibilities for inter-departmental cooperation, both at the level of the EUI as a whole and within the core group of researchers that have shown immediate interest in the initiative; second part investigates geographical coverage of different subregions/countries within CEE/SEE in the personal structure of EUI researchers and in their research. A summary of interim conclusions follows each subsection of the report, and overall conclusions are given in the final section of the report.

Whereas the purpose of the report is to evaluate existing resources, it is also seen as an opportunity to reach out to the researchers and to raise their awareness and interest in the activities of the EGE initiative. Hence, the method tried to combine all these goals by sending the e-mail with the description of the activities that have taken place thus far, asking them to provide a 5 to 6 sentence abstract of their research project. The researchers chosen to be contacted in this way satisfied one or both of the following criteria: they either originate from CEE/SEE region or they deal with the region in their research. The choice has been made to contact only these researchers, because it would create a sense that they are approached in a more personal (and personalized) manner than through an e-mail sent to all researchers regardless of their research topic or origin. Furthermore, this would not leave out people interested in the initiative that do not fulfill any of the above mentioned criteria, as an invitation e-mail to all researchers, fellows and professors had previously been circulated when the initiative commenced, and when they had an opportunity to express their interest in the initiative.

Based on a preliminary analysis of the information from the EUI website, a group of 91 researchers was selected to be approached. These are the researchers that will be in their second, third and fourth year of PhD during the academic year of 2011/2012. In other words, they will stay at the EUI for at least another year (or exceptionally shorter). However, at the time of writing (September 2011) it was not possible to obtain information about future first year researchers, which can be done in a form of an appendix to this report.

On 2nd August 2011 the e-mail has been sent to the group of 91 researchers. By 18th September, 22 researchers replied, expressing their interest in the initiative and providing a short abstract of their theses. It is therefore appropriate to pay attention in the analysis to the fact that there are two relevant groups of researchers: 1) those coming from the region but not working on a project that is connected to the region itself; 2) those working on a project that bears connection with the region, irrespectively of their origin. Furthermore, there are two clusters of researchers within both of these groups: a) those who have expressed their interest ('core group'); b) those who have not replied to the e-mail expressing their interest.<sup>2</sup> The report deals with all researchers that can potentially be relevant for the initiative; however, special attention is paid to those who are more willing to participate at this point.

Finally, the report proceeds on the assumption that the relevant data from the EUI website is not dated or unreliable. This is because it is reasonable to presume that those whose project has changed since the beginning of their studies have either updated their profile on the website or responded to the e-mail clarifying the current status of their research.

---

<sup>2</sup> The latter group presents a 'dormant potential' for the initiative, as it cannot be straightforwardly assumed that these researchers are not interested in the initiative. Reasons for this can be many, and further activities can be undertaken to reach out to them.

## **Subject-Matter (Substantive) Analysis**

The aim of this analysis is to investigate subject-matters of research projects at the EUI done on CEE/SEE region or done by people coming from this region. There are several different layers of analysis that deserve special attention and that will therefore be covered in different sub-sections. First, all departments are analyzed separately, in order to determine whether there are some trends within the departments or different disciplines. Secondly, in the next section the report will investigate what are possible links and synergies that can be established between the departments and how different types of research conducted in different departments can best profit from one another. Finally, the core group of researchers and their PhD projects are explored as to discover if there are some common traits in their research or issues that will be of immediate interest to this group, and which are at the same time timely and relevant from a broader perspective.

### ***Department of Law (LAW)***

The first characteristic of the LAW department PhD projects is that only a couple of them focus on the CEE/SEE region directly. This issue will be taken up in more detail in the section on geographical analysis, but it is worth mentioning here as well, because it reduces to a certain extent the potential of LAW researchers to deal with the issues related to CEE/SEE. Therefore, it should be borne in mind that the report here analyzes only general, and not geographically relevant topics, which can be useful for the initiative indirectly. At the same time, there are PhD projects that probably have more direct consequences for the region, but due to the lack of further details it is not possible to assess to what extent is this the case (take for example the topic ‘Human Rights in EU External Policy’ where it is reasonable to expect that it will have great significance for CEE/SEE). Furthermore, many of the topics that are connected with EU law are by definition relevant for those CEE/SEE countries that wish to accede to the EU.

There is hardly a common denominator for a variety of PhD projects at the law department. Also, the nature of contemporary legal research that cuts through many traditional branches of law, disciplines and even social sciences prevents well-grounded generalizations. For example, there are three topics in international law, but as diverse as international criminal law, cultural property law and the control of nuclear export. Hence all conclusions should be taken with caution.

One of the features that can be detected is that topics pertaining to the functioning of the market (in the broadest possible sense) seem to dominate among the researchers coming from CEE/SEE. If we count in labour law and social rights issues in areas that are relevant for the regulation of market, exactly half of PhD topics deal with the economic law or market in one way or the other. Now, this may not tell us much because it may be the case that such topics prevail in the whole department, that there are much more developments in these fields of law, that this is a common trend in the situation of economic crisis or that this group of topics and subject-fields is very diverse itself. However, it may also point out to the fact that the researchers coming from CEE/SEE countries recognize these issues as more important. This deserves further investigation, because it would be interesting to determine whether there is a connection between researchers’ origin and choice of topic; in particular, whether researchers from CEE/SEE consider economic transformation and development as more important or relevant for their own countries than human rights, development of public institutions or other issues pertaining to the ‘political’ part of the transition process.<sup>3</sup>

We can conclude that most LAW researchers deal with contract law, transnational (private) regulation, consumer protection and competition law and particular combinations of these fields of law. Other

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, only two CEE/SEE researchers are dealing with constitutional law.

researchers deal with EU institutions and their functioning, international law, labour law and social rights, constitutional law, environmental law, data protection, intellectual property and human rights in different contexts. One of the interesting features is, however, that none of the researchers are investigating issues pertaining to transition, institution-building or any other topic that may be related to the authoritarian legacy that CEE/SEE region is often taken to have. One may pose the question to what extent is this a consequence of methodological stance that accentuates doctrinal research more than socio-legal approaches (e.g. focusing on the question what is law instead on why the law has changed). On the other hand, there seems to be a lot of expertise on different areas of EU law which may be relevant for issues connected with Europeanization processes.

Interim conclusions:

1. There is almost no focus in the LAW department on issues related to the CEE/SEE region.
2. PhD projects at the LAW department do not, at least directly, have any connection with the authoritarian past or legacies of CEE/SEE region.
3. There is a certain dominance of topics that deal with economic issues among LAW researchers coming from CEE/SEE countries.
4. There is a lot of expertise among LAW researchers on EU law, which is a significant asset for issues pertaining to Europeanization.

### ***Department of Economics (ECO)***

Although considerable differences exist between all departments when research methodologies are compared, these differences are most significant when the ECO department is in question. There are three most important dissimilarities: first, in the ECO department, a PhD thesis usually consists of three papers which need not be strongly connected; secondly, theses titles are more general as they usually relate to universally applicable economic principles; third, during the first year there is less detailed focus on the thesis itself in contrast to other departments. For example, it is hard to judge about the research from the title that reads ‘Quantitative Economics’, because it tells us nothing about the specific focus of the project.

For all these reasons, it is hard to generalize about the patterns of research, especially having in mind quite limited number of researchers at the economics department that are relevant for the initiative (16). There are, however, some conclusions that can be drawn. Out of all researchers at the ECO, there is only one that potentially deals with CEE/SEE region. As the thesis refers to ‘emerging market economies’, there is a lot of space for speculation whether this includes some CEE/SEE countries or not. Yet, the topic is certainly relevant for the region, even if the thesis does not use empirical data from CEE/SEE. Furthermore, it is quite reasonable to assume that many of the general economic laws can be applied to specific issues related to CEE/SEE region.

Interim conclusions:

1. There is little or no research on CEE/SEE region at the ECO. Only one researcher deals with ‘emerging market economies’.
2. Having in mind the general character of economic laws, it may be that many PhD projects are applicable to particular problems of CEE/SEE.

### ***Department of Political and Social Sciences (SPS)***

In contrast to LAW and ECO departments, in the SPS department there is a considerable amount of research related to the CEE/SEE region. The vast majority of researchers coming from the region are exploring a topic related to the region itself; in addition, there are a lot of researchers from Western

Europe that are investigating such topics. As a preliminary conclusion, it can be underlined that there is a lot of potential for the EGE initiative in the SPS department.

Further to this, there are also a lot of overlapping and common points between different PhD projects. Even though they each focus on a different problem, the common thread for almost all of them is that they are connected to transition and changes that have occurred in CEE/SEE countries over the last two decades. Out of 30 PhD projects of people coming from the region or working on a topic related to it, 18 are dealing with transition, democratization, Europeanization or similar issues.

Let us explore in some more detail what are different questions within the wider topic of transition.<sup>4</sup> Firstly, there are several topics that, broadly speaking, deal with institution-building in former communist countries. There are different approaches within this group. Some take a macro approach and look at institutional and political setting as a whole (in a given country) to investigate what are the prospects of establishing functional liberal-democracies in the region, or deal with institutional change in general, from a more theoretical point of view using CEE/SEE countries as an empirical base. Others concentrate on a particular institution or reform: in this group, dominant themes are electoral, civil service and police reforms. Within the broader topic of democratic institutions building, there is one researcher working on the relationship between transformation of media regulation, ownership in media and democratization; another one dealing with the effects of Europeanization on political parties; and one exploring the role and effects of EU structural funds on partnerships between NGOs and private enterprises.

Yet another significant cluster of researchers deals with particular policies that have changed as a consequence of democratic transition and economic transformation. Within this group, many researchers work on welfare state policies, such as pension and tax reforms or social policy and healthcare. Some researchers also tackle economic changes, but from a different angle. Such are topics that broadly fall within the remit of political economy or sociology. There are several researchers dealing with the issue of economic changes that have occurred in the region in last two decades, and some of them try to trace neo-corporatist practices in CEE/SEE region, while others investigate social classes in post-socialist context. In the context of changing policies in CEE/SEE region, there are a couple of researchers working on transformation of environmental policies.

There is a notable number of researchers working in the field of citizenship and migration. Among them, there are several that directly deal with issues pertaining to Europeanization of CEE/SEE countries and consequences of their accession to the EU for migration in Europe. These topics explore, for example, policies towards migrants in their country of origin or ways in which migrants integrate in their new communities. The common denominator is that these topics deal with migrants from CEE/SEE coming to Western Europe. There are also other students that research topics connected with citizenship, but from a more theoretical perspective or with regard to a particular element of citizenship (e.g. disenfranchisement). Furthermore, there is a researcher working on the ways in which nation-building in CEE/SEE region was different from similar processes elsewhere.

Apart from these groups of researchers roughly sharing common interests, there are others who specialize in political parties and voting behavior, social movements, religion and politics, political economy and social psychology.

---

<sup>4</sup> We will use the term 'transition' to cover different processes and concepts, such as democratization, institution-building, Europeanization, economic change, etc. Although these processes may be different and not exclusively covered by the term 'transition', it is for the reasons of simplicity that they are subsumed under this umbrella term.

Interim conclusions:

1. There is a great potential for research of issues pertaining to CEE/SEE region in the SPS department; many researchers deal with such issues in their PhD projects.
2. Most researchers within this group work on projects connected to democratic and economic transformation of CEE/SEE countries. Within this wider group, some focus on institution building, and others on policy changes mostly in the domain of welfare state and environment. Most of the potential in the SPS department for research on CEE/SEE lies within this group.
3. There is a significant group of researchers working on citizenship and migration, some of which focus on CEE/SEE countries.
4. Other relevant areas with fewer researchers included are political behavior and parties, social movements, religion, political economy and social psychology.

***Department of History and Civilization (HEC)***

Similarly to the SPS department, there is a lot of research that is focused on the CEE/SEE region in the HEC department. Again, the majority of researchers coming from the region actually work on a topic that is related to it, and there are some researchers from Western Europe that deal with such topics.

However, as is the case with other departments, HEC department has its specificities in methodology, manner in which the topics are approached, and problems which are considered as interesting and relevant. One obvious difference stems from the nature of history as a discipline - namely, temporal focus of the research matters more than in other departments. Let us therefore commence with a tentative framework that divides all HEC PhD projects into two groups - those that focus on the period before the fall of communism (or shortly after the fall, i.e. on transitional period), and those that deal with more distant history. This division may be relevant because, for example, investigation of communist period in CEE/SEE countries is very well connected to the research of those from other departments working on institution-building after the fall of communism.

There are 8 researchers that deal with periods of authoritarian governance in CEE/SEE region. Although their projects are diverse, there are few specific groups that can be detected. Three researchers work on topics that in one way or another look at culture (films, satirical magazines or festivals) as a political tool, either for oppression or opposition in authoritarian environments. There are two researchers investigating international relations during the cold war (Soviet activity in Latin America and informal contacts in Baltic region). One researcher deals with labour movement in pre-civil war Yugoslavia; another with multicultural and religious issues, broadly conceived (attitudes towards Jews by Catholic church in Poland); and the last one deals with the concept of 'socialist city' in Soviet Union.

Among researchers that concentrate on more distant past, there are several characteristic themes for PhD projects. A significant number of researchers explore the historiography of art, and most of them connect that theme with broader social processes in the particular period they are researching. So for example, these projects (5 altogether) look at art galleries, dance, music, monuments, opera, ballet, or popular culture, in the perspective of social stratification and the creation of the public sphere, identity building, forms of social behavior in times of occupation or attitudes towards immigrants. When few others are added to this group (those already mentioned that deal with culture in authoritarian periods) it is clear that historiography of art and culture plays an important role in the HEC department; however, it is almost always the case that these topics are put into perspective of broader social processes that are also relevant today.

Another important group of researchers work on topics that would in contemporary language fall within the remit of multiculturalism. There are four of these altogether, out of which two focus on religious relations in the Ottoman empire and two on the position of Russian Orthodox church. If those



that explore identity building, inter-religious relations under the authoritarian rule and migration are added, then we may conclude that there are also important potentials to deal with issues of multiculturalism in the HEC department.

Finally, those not already mentioned deal with, for example: social rights and the position of lower classes (two researchers, one doing PhD on strikes in Russia before the first revolution and the other one works on poverty in Istanbul); constitutional reforms in 19th century Ottoman Empire (which would today probably fit under the rubric of institution building or transition); Chernobyl as a transnational collective memory (that certainly has significant repercussions for contemporary ecological policies); and history of ideas (the topic is Benthamism in SEE, so it may be oriented towards the concrete policies that follow his utilitarian philosophy).

Similarly to the SPS department, there is an important potential in HEC department for the EGE initiative. Not only is there a lot of research on CEE/SEE region, but also some aspects of these PhD projects make them susceptible to interlinks with research that is done in other departments. Although we will discuss this more in the next section, let us just briefly mention how most of PhD projects in HEC are multilayered, in the sense that they would fit many different subject matters. For example, someone doing history of art may also be touching upon issues of identity building, social transformation or authoritarian governance. This is an important asset which makes PhD topics from history department very broad when subject matters are in question, although they may look at first glance as rather narrow.

Interim conclusions:

1. There is a lot of potential for research on CEE/SEE region in the HEC department. Many researchers deal with the region in their projects.
2. In terms of temporal focus of the research, there are two groups of researchers: those that deal with recent communist or authoritarian periods in CEE/SEE countries and those that focus on a more distant history. In the former group, researchers concentrate on the history of art and culture in relation with politics and wider social processes, international relations, multicultural issues, labour movements, and history of socialist urbanism.
3. Researchers not dealing with communist or other autocratic governments in CEE/SEE, work on following issues: history of art (again in connection with wider social processes); multiculturalism; social rights and position of lower classes; institutional transformation; history of ideas; ecology.
4. In general, PhD projects at HEC department are multi-layered and touch upon different important issues.

### ***Possibilities for Inter-Departmental Cooperation***

As it was mentioned in the beginning, one of the goals of the EGE initiative is to establish a network of researchers interested in or coming from the CEE/SEE region. To do so, one has to look for possible connections and points of common interest between different departments. This is even more important because professional relations established between EUI researchers habitually tend to be more intra-departmental than inter-departmental. Hence this part of the analysis may be the most important for the success of the initiative.

Nevertheless, there are some immediate problems to this kind of analysis. First of all, it is highly speculative. It searches for common topics that will be interesting to the widest possible range of researchers, but there may be no concrete will on their part to participate in such a project. Thus the next part where researchers from the 'core group' are analyzed will be much less speculative, because there is a clear will of that group to participate in the EGE activities immediately. Although the response to the e-mail sent around was relatively good (25%), the e-mail itself was quite general, so the assumption with which we can start is that other researchers would have been more attracted by

the initiative had it fitted with their particular focus of research. In short, the closer the topic of possible research or cooperative project is to the specific PhD project of a researcher, the more ready she will be to participate in it. Moreover, by choosing an interesting and relevant substantive field that will attract a number of researchers, chances are that it will draw some researchers who are neither dealing with nor coming from the region, but are interested in that specific subject-field.

There is a great disparity in the amount of research on CEE/SEE between departments. As we have seen, SPS and HEC have quite a few researchers that deal with the region; however, in LAW and ECO departments there is a very limited number of researchers working on the region. Because the idea is to create inter-departmental synergies, common points of interest should attract both LAW and ECO researchers if possible. Further reason for this is that although there are many researchers that can potentially be attracted by the initiative (91 altogether, but maybe much more when all EUI researchers are counted in), when departments are looked at separately, the number of researchers potentially interested and useful for the initiative is much smaller.

One possible topic that could be of interest for all and could help to establish a network of people interested in the initiative is reflection on differences in methodologies and ways in which researchers choose PhD projects. It would be interesting to investigate why, for example, almost all researchers coming from CEE/SEE at SPS and HEC and also some Western Europeans conduct research on the region, but almost no one does so in LAW and ECO? The puzzle is even greater because most Western Europeans have to overcome a language barrier in their research on CEE/SEE, whereas such a barrier would not exist in the case of researchers whose origin is from the region. Are there any specific circumstances connected with the CEE/SEE region that determine the choice of topics in different disciplines? What is the situation in the region itself? These are some of the questions that may be interesting for all researchers, regardless of the department and their particular research. Yet, the problem with such a general topic is that it may not attract any response from the researchers themselves, because they may not want to use their limited resources in terms of time to investigate issues that fall outside of the scope of their PhD research.

Another potential topic for further interdepartmental research could relate to the economic transformation in the region. This field carries the most potential, because it could truly attract people from each department. It is clear that the ECO researchers have by definition the interest and potential to deal with such issues, so the broad theme of economic transformation should be narrowed down in accordance with particular interests of researchers from other departments. It seems that one of the possible topics could be connected with the balance between market and social welfare values. There is considerable research done on this topic in the LAW department (in the field of competition law, consumer protection, social rights, etc); SPS department (there are a number of researchers working on social policy issues, and some others concentrating on economic transformation and its effects on society); and HEC (those working on periods of communist rule could join in by explaining the historical causes of contemporary economic policies or specific reactions to global economic challenges in CEE/SEE countries; furthermore, some of those investigating poverty and lower classes would probably be attracted by such topics as well). In addition, such a topic would be timely and relevant from a broader perspective, especially in times of economic crisis, so it may attract a wider pool of researchers not only from CEE/SEE.

Because of the specific situation in the economics department (there are no researchers that deal with CEE/SEE in their projects), other possible topics will hardly attract any of ECO researchers. Therefore, we will focus on possible synergies between other three departments in the remainder of this section.

One of the most researched issues when it comes to SEE/SEE in the SPS department is institution-building and institutional change. In the HEC department, there are some researchers that deal with institutions, and in particular with institutional change during specific periods in history. Also, HEC researchers that deal with periods of authoritarian rule in CEE/SEE could put contemporary problems

into historical perspective. Since law research most of the time deals with institutions, there should be some room for cooperation. However, it seems that LAW department researchers are less concerned with changes as such, and more with the existing rules and doctrines. If the potential topic on institution-building is put into the perspective of Europeanization, this would possibly attract some LAW researchers that specialize in EU law.

In HEC department, many researchers deal with identity building, multiculturalism and religious toleration. On the other hand, one of the important topics in the SPS department is migration and citizenship. These are intertwined topics with many common points of interest for research between these two departments. Furthermore, topics pertaining to citizenship and migration would be of interest to those at the LAW department that explore citizenship and similar issues. Such a topic would attract probably a broader range of researchers in the LAW department, because there are many researchers who do not come from CEE/SEE conducting research on citizenship and migration.

Finally, there are some subject fields (e.g. environment) that attract a few researchers from each department. Should further activities in these fields be conducted, there would probably be a need for expanding the cooperation outside of the EUI.

Interim conclusions:

1. There are several possibilities for creating links between EUI departments without necessarily including partners from outside of the institute; nevertheless, having in mind the limited number of researchers and differences between departments regarding the interest in CEE/SEE region, not all of these possible links could attract researchers from each department.
2. One research topic that could be of interest for researchers from all departments is economic transformation in CEE/SEE. More specifically, a number of people at the EUI currently investigate different aspects of welfare state and state interference in the market.
3. Another topic could be institutional transformation, particularly if put into the Europeanization perspective. This subject field would probably not attract researchers from ECO department.
4. There is some interest in all departments but ECO for the research on citizenship, migration, inter-cultural relations and religion.
5. For other topics, such as environment, there would be a need to look for cooperation and partnership outside of the EUI.

### ***Potentials for Cooperation within the ‘Core Group’ of Researchers***

The core group of researchers that responded to the e-mail and expressed interest to join the EGE initiative may be described as heterogeneous in terms of topics that are explored. This is expected - there are 22 researchers coming from 4 departments that apply diverse methodologies and approaches to social science research. In other words, it is much easier to build interlinks within the wider pool of 91 researchers that are interesting for the initiative. On the other hand, there is readiness to join the initiative in the core group, which may be an important element that is missing in the wider group generally.

Let us briefly introduce subject fields in which researchers from the core group are working, and then we can proceed to see whether there are some connections between departments. The initiative has received quite a good response in the LAW department, which may come as a surprise because there are not many people dealing with the region in the department in general. There are 9 LAW researchers that responded to the initiative: 3 of them are dealing with private and commercial law issues (construction agreements in law and economics perspective; private regulation and EU economic law; EU contract and consumer law), 3 working on international law (international criminal law; cultural heritage law; environmental law), one dealing with EU institutional law (the role of

national parliaments after Lisbon), one doing a topic on the intersection of labour law and human rights (right to privacy) and one dealing with constitutional law and human rights (constitutional interpretation).

In the ECO department, there are 2 researchers that have responded. One is dealing with microeconomics (networks theory and internal capital market) and the other with links between technological advancement and income inequality.

In the SPS department, the response to the initiative was good. There are 9 researchers interested in the initiative working in the following fields: institution-building and policy change in transition (5 researchers working on creation of bureaucratic capacity, transformation of healthcare policies, implementation of European requirements in environmental policies, media reform and police reform); voting behavior (2 researchers, one working on political apathy and the other one on the ways in which voters inform themselves about politics and policies); one working on nation-building and self-determination and one on citizenship and criminal disenfranchisement.

In the HEC department, there are only two researchers that have responded. One is dealing with history of early modern art in Poland and its implications on re-negotiation of one's social status, and the other one on the role of a satirical magazine during military regime in Turkey as a tool of opposition.

Looking at departments separately, we may conclude that there is significant will in the SPS and LAW department to join the initiative. On the other hand, the response was somewhat more lukewarm in HEC and ECO. In the LAW department, there is no prevailing or dominant topic among researchers from the core group, whereas in the SPS department there is a certain dominance of topics pertaining to policy and institutional change.

If we compare the core group to the wider group of researchers at the EUI as a whole, it seems that there is almost no interest on the part of researchers working on citizenship and migration. What is left are economic policy changes and intersection between market and social values (there are researchers both in LAW and SPS interested in this topic) and institutional change and transition (there are some SPS researchers interested in this issue and one at HEC department, but also some of the LAW researchers could fit into such topic).

The main conclusion is that none of these subject-field related groups contains enough interested researchers to pass the threshold of numerically significant research group, particularly if the goal is to engage as many people from different departments as possible. Nonetheless, this does not mean that the will that exists among the researchers from the core group should not be utilized. For example, researchers from the core group can form a basis of future cooperation in different subject-fields, and their enthusiasm to participate can be useful when administrative and organizational issues are at stake. Furthermore, the existence of topics that are of interest for general pool of researchers within the core group (e.g. economic or institutional transformation) justifies the belief that they could form a successful nucleus of future cooperation that will attract more researchers that are passive at the moment or that need an additional impetus to get involved.

Interim conclusions:

1. Core group consists of 22 researchers that are immediately ready to take part in the initiative.
2. There is a very good response from LAW and SPS departments, but much less from ECO and HEC.
3. There are some common points of interest for a number of researchers from the core group, such as economic, institutional or policy transformation.
4. Because in each of possible subject fields the number of researchers is not high, the core group can be utilized as a nucleus of future cooperation rather than a research team that is already available.

## **Geographical Analysis**

This part of the report deals with geographical dispersion of both relevant researchers and their topics. Therefore, there are two separate analyses contained in this part: the first one investigates which regions are covered by origin of researchers and the second one explores which subregions or countries are currently being researched at the EUI. The rationale for the first analysis is not quite straightforward, as it does not bear directly on the most relevant aim of this report: to assess human and research potentials of the EUI regarding the CEE/SEE. However, on closer inspection, the place of origin can be quite relevant. Having in mind one of the purposes of the whole EGE initiative - to increase visibility of the EUI in the region - this kind of analysis can show whether the admission process secures a fairly even distribution of researchers over the region. Furthermore, this analysis can show what linguistic capabilities (on a native speaker level) researchers have, and hence add to the evaluation of potential of the EUI as a whole to deal with CEE/SEE region or parts thereof. Finally, as this report will show, geographical analysis leads to very interesting results when data from different departments are compared.

### ***Geographical Analysis According to Origin***

Let us briefly introduce some rough data to be analyzed. It is worthwhile mentioning that researchers taken into account belong to all four major (and overlapping) groups detected in the beginning: 1) researchers originating from the region; 2) researchers working on a project that bears connection with the region, regardless of their origin; 3) researchers who have expressed their interest ('core group') in the EGE initiative; and 4) researchers who have not replied to the e-mail expressing their interest.

**Table 1 - Place of Origin of LAW Researchers**

<b>LAW Department</b>		
<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of researchers (22 altogether)</b>	<b>Percent in total number of researchers (in %)</b>
Belarus	1	4.5
Bulgaria	2	9
Croatia	1	4.5
Hungary	1	4.5
Lithuania	1	4.5
Poland	9	40
Romania	1	4.5
Russia	1	4.5
Serbia	2	9
Slovenia	2	9
Turkey	1	4.5

This group of researchers is relatively widely dispersed across the region; however, there are two notable aberrations - first, more than 40% of the group comes from Poland; second, some countries are still unrepresented (Latvia, Estonia, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Ukraine, Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo, Albania, Macedonia).<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, there are no researchers from Western Europe in this group, which is a consequence of the fact that there is no one conducting research on CEE/SEE within the law department who is not at the same time from the region itself.

---

<sup>5</sup> Former USSR countries that are not specifically mentioned are not represented in the group as well. This is done throughout this subsection because repeating the whole list of countries would consume too much space.

**Table 2 - Place of Origin of SPS Researchers**

<b>SPS Department</b>		
<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of researchers (30 altogether)</b>	<b>Percent in total number of researchers (in %)</b>
Austria	1	3.3
Belarus	1	3.3
Croatia	3	10
Estonia	1	3.3
France	1	3.3
Georgia	1	3.3
Italy	4	13.3
Latvia	1	3.3
Macedonia	1	3.3
Poland	3	10
Romania	3	10
Russia	1	3.3
Serbia	1	3.3
Slovenia	1	3.3
Spain	1	3.3
Switzerland	1	3.3
Turkey	4	13.3
Ukraine	1	3.3

This group of researchers is much more geographically dispersed than the one from the law department. On the one hand, there are a lot of researchers from Western Europe working on the topic related to CEE/SEE, and on the other, there is no dominant nationality (Italy and Turkey have the highest shares with 13.3% each). There are however some CEE/SEE countries that are not represented (Lithuania, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo, Albania).

**Table 3 - Place of Origin of HEC Researchers**

<b>HEC Department</b>		
<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of researchers (23 altogether)</b>	<b>Percent in total number of researchers (in %)</b>
Austria	1	4.3
Estonia	1	4.3
Germany	2	8.6
Greece	1	4.3
Italy	1	4.3
Poland	4	17.3
Romania	2	8.6
Russia	3	13
Serbia	1	4.3
Sweden	1	4.3
Switzerland	1	4.3
Turkey	4	17.3
UK	1	4.3

This group of researchers, similarly to the previous one from the SPS department, has many Western Europeans working on topics related to CEE/SEE. Although the distribution between the countries is rather even, Poles and Turks each amount to 17.3 percent of the group and there are even more CEE/SEE countries that are not represented (Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Albania, Kosovo, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, Hungary, Slovakia, Czech Republic).



**Table 4 - Place of Origin of ECO Researchers**

ECO Department		
Country	Number of researchers (16 altogether)	Percent in total number of researchers (in %)
Armenia	1	6.2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	6.2
Estonia	1	6.2
Hungary	1	6.2
Poland	5	31.2
Russia	3	18.7
Slovenia	2	12.5
Turkey	2	12.5

This group of researchers contains the least researchers that are coming from the region or working on it. Again, the Polish present the most dominant category contributing to almost 1/3 of the group. Coverage of CEE/SEE region is relatively poor (not represented countries are: Lithuania, Latvia, Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, Romania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Albania, Kosovo, Serbia, Croatia, Slovakia, Czech Republic).

Let us introduce data for the EUI as a whole and then for the core group of researchers that expressed their interest in the initiative.

**Table 5 - Place of Origin of EUI Researchers**

<b>EUI</b>		
<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of researchers (91 altogether)</b>	<b>Percent in total number of researchers (in %)</b>
Armenia	1	1.1
Austria	2	2.2
Belarus	2	2.2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	1.1
Bulgaria	2	2.2
Croatia	4	4.4
Estonia	3	3.3
France	1	1.1
Georgia	1	1.1
Germany	2	2.2
Greece	1	1.1
Hungary	2	2.2
Italy	5	5.5
Latvia	1	1.1
Lithuania	1	1.1
Macedonia	1	1.1
Poland	21	23.1
Romania	6	6.6
Russia	8	8.8
Serbia	4	4.4
Slovenia	5	5.5
Spain	1	1.1
Sweden	1	1.1
Switzerland	2	2.2
Turkey	11	12.1
UK	1	1.1
Ukraine	1	1.1

The analysis of the group of researchers that is selected according to their origin and/or research focus on CEE/SEE region shows the potential of the EUI to become a major actor in expertise on CEE/SEE. The analysis also shows strengths and weaknesses of the EUI admission process. As a preliminary remark, it should be underlined that there is great diversity of countries from which the EUI researchers originate. It should be borne in mind that the EUI presents one of the most diverse academic places in Europe. However, there are still some CEE/SEE that are not represented at the EUI. These are: Moldova, Albania, Kosovo, Slovakia and Czech Republic. In terms of even distribution of places within the CEE/SEE region, there is a dominance of the Poles which amount to roughly 1/4 of all researchers coming from or working on the region. Apart from this, Turkey is also well represented with 11 researchers. There are also two other geographically relevant clusters of researchers coming from: former Yugoslav republics (15 researchers); and former USSR (18 researchers from former USSR including Baltic EU member states, and 13 excluding these states). Therefore, there is potential (geographically speaking) for research on former USSR and Yugoslav countries, although not all of them are represented in the pool of researchers. However, at least in the case of Yugoslav countries, this should not present any linguistic problems. Furthermore, there is significant potential for research on Poland.

Another interesting conclusion may be drawn from the structure of researchers coming from Western Europe and doing their research on topics connected to CEE/SEE. The only country that has significantly more researchers working on CEE/SEE is Italy with 5 researchers (and the only others that have more than one are Austria, Switzerland and Germany with two each). Even more interesting are the data for the core group of researchers that have shown immediate interest in the initiative.

**Table 6 - Place of Origin of Researchers from the Core Group**

<b>EUI (core group)</b>		
<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of researchers (22 altogether)</b>	<b>Percent in total number of researchers (in %)</b>
Austria	1	4.5
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	4.5
Bulgaria	1	4.5
Croatia	2	9
Italy	4	18
Macedonia	1	4.5
Poland	5	22.7
Russia	1	4.5
Serbia	3	13.5
Slovenia	1	4.5
Switzerland	1	4.5
Turkey	1	4.5

When compared to the wider group of researchers at the EUI as a whole, the researchers from former USSR and Turkey have shown little interest in the initiative despite their high overall numbers (only one researcher from Russia and one from Turkey have replied). On the other hand, 5 Poles have replied, which is in proportion to their share in the wider population of researchers (22.7%). Similarly, there is significant interest from researchers coming from former Yugoslavia (8 researchers or 36.4%). Therefore, linguistically and geographically, there would be some sense in focusing on former Yugoslavia or Poland in the initiative itself, at least in the beginning. This conclusion is also based on the fact that many countries of CEE/SEE are not represented in this limited group of 20 researchers who are ready to join the initiative straightaway.

Interim conclusions:

1. There is a great diversity of origin of researchers coming from or working on CEE/SEE region.
2. Analysis of researchers' origin per department shows that: there are no Western Europeans in Law or Economics department working on CEE/SEE region; in all departments there are at least some CEE/SEE countries that are not represented; in all but SPS department researchers of Polish origin are dominant in numbers.
3. On the level of the EUI as a whole there are some clusters of researchers that could have potential for research on a specific subregion or a country. These are researchers coming from former USSR, former Yugoslavia, Turkey and Poland. However, when the core group is analyzed, out of these groups only researchers coming from former Yugoslavia and Poland seem interested in the initiative.
4. On the level of the EUI as a whole, following countries do not have a single researcher: Moldova, Albania, Kosovo, Slovakia and Czech Republic. Furthermore, many of the former USSR republics are not represented as well.

### ***Geographical Analysis According to the Focus of Research***

In the second part of this section, we will focus on the analysis of subregions or countries that are being researched regardless of the origin of a particular researcher that is conducting the research. This analysis may be more relevant than the previous one, but is also faced with methodological problems. First, if the researcher has not provided a short summary of the dissertation, then it is in many cases not possible to reveal whether some of the case studies relate to the CEE/SEE just from the title of the research. Therefore, for this analysis it is more relevant which regions or countries are covered by researchers from the core group. Secondly, it is hard to statistically convey the depth of exploration or importance that some country or subregion have in a given research. The only way to illustrate general trends is to count each country once if it appears in a research. Therefore, data that follow relate to the number of appearances of a given country in PhD projects.

There are significant differences between departments when geographical focus of the research is in question. This may also point to the general methodological differences that exist between different social sciences. As a rule, lawyers and economists (at least the ones that have been examined here) do not focus on a particular region or a country. At best, their research title contains more general notions that in concrete PhD projects may play out as specific case studies (such as 'emerging market economies', 'transitional countries' etc). There are reasons to believe that there is more research on specific countries of CEE/SEE when theses are examined in more depth - for example, one of the researchers from the core group uses Bulgaria as a case study which would have stayed undisclosed if only the title of the research was known. Apart from this case, one PhD topic at the LAW department specifically deals with Turkey. Be that as it may, there is a clear tendency not to research CEE/SEE region in both LAW and ECO departments. There are only two persons that do so in the LAW department (already mentioned Bulgarian and Turkish cases), but most of the researchers from the core group expressed their willingness and ability to serve as experts on their country of origin, if the research is connected with their respective field of expertise.

Situation is somewhat different in the SPS and HEC departments.

**Table 7 - Geographical Focus of Research in the SPS Department**

<b>SPS Department</b>	
<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of times it appears in PhD projects</b>
Belarus	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1
Central Eastern Europe	3
Croatia	4
Czech Republic	1
Hungary	1
Kosovo	1
Macedonia	1
Moldova	1
Poland	2
Russia	1
Serbia	3
Slovenia	2
South Caucasian Region	1
Turkey	4
Ukraine	1

It is clear that fragmented data cannot lead to firm conclusions, especially because there are references to vast subregions and not to particular countries. Therefore, it is suitable to compare different subregions with caution to see whether there are some patterns and only then to conclude whether some countries are more in the focus than others. However, it should be borne in mind that the count is not precise - for example, if someone mentions Central Eastern Europe in the title it means that she is researching an unknown number of countries while the region is counted only once; also, it may be that the same person is conducting research on a cluster of individually mentioned countries that will then significantly raise the number of the subregion to which these countries belong; finally, some regions contain more countries than others and if there is numerically more research on that region it does not mean that it is covered in the same depth as some others that appear to be less researched. For all these reasons the exact percentages are left out from the table.

Be that as it may, there are some subregions that obviously draw more attention. These are: former Yugoslavia (mentioned 12 times); Central Eastern Europe (7 times); former USSR (5); Turkey (4). It would be very hard to hypothesize why some regions attract more attention than others. For example, it may be that former Yugoslavia currently scores higher than Bulgaria or Romania because of specific

historical circumstances (war, etc), linguistic similarities or susceptibility to comparative research, but one of explanations could lie in growing interest in countries that are still to accede to the EU and that have not yet finished the process of transition.

The situation is a bit different in the History and Civilization department:<sup>6</sup>

**Table 8 - Geographical Focus of Research in the HEC Department**

<b>HEC Department</b>	
<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of times it appears in PhD projects</b>
Belarus	1
Eastern Europe	1
Estonia	2
Former Yugoslavia	2
Lithuania	1
Poland	7
Romania	2
Russia	3
Southern Europe	1
Turkey	6
Ukraine	2
USSR	2
Uzbekistan	1

In HEC department, former USSR republics (and the USSR itself) are dominant - they are mentioned 12 times. Also, Poland is mentioned 7 times and Turkey 6 times. Other countries or regions do not nearly score as high. An obvious difference with the SPS department is that former Yugoslavia attracts significantly less attention: only two PhD projects deal with that particular region in the HEC department. This seems to confirm the intuition that the reasons for the increased interest for former Yugoslavian countries in the SPS department lie in Europeanization processes these countries are going through at the moment. On the other hand, historically they may not be as significant as USSR or Turkey for example. As a conclusion, it is clear that there is a potential for research on former USSR countries in the HEC department, somewhat less capacity for research on Poland and Turkey, and considerably less interest in other CEE/SEE countries.

<sup>6</sup> Regions and countries are identified under their modern names, unless the region/country is explicitly mentioned in the given research with its former, historically relevant name (e.g. USSR).

Exploring in some more detail which sub-regions and countries are researched on the level of the EUI as a whole would blur the difference between the departments which obviously exists and would hence not make much sense. For example, it would equalize the number of researchers interested in former USSR and former Yugoslav countries, whereas there is a clear cross-departmental difference; or, it would not say anything about the low intensity of research on CEE/SEE countries in LAW and ECO departments. Having also in mind methodological concerns expressed earlier on regarding the uncertain results of the statistical analysis that is more illustrative than conclusive, it is better to examine only the core group of researchers to discover whether some trends of research can be spotted there.

**Table 9 - Geographical Focus of Research in the Core Group**

<b>EUI (core group)</b>	
<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of times it appears in PhD projects</b>
Bulgaria	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1
Central Eastern Europe	1
Croatia	3
Czech Republic	1
Hungary	1
Kosovo	1
Lithuania	1
Poland	2
Serbia	3
Turkey	2

As a preliminary remark, we should underline that within the core group only 10 (out of 22) researchers actually deal with CEE/SEE region in their PhD projects. Thus, any conclusion about the geographical distribution or expertise in this regard is quite limited and should be taken with caution. A slight tendency of research on former Yugoslav republics is present in the core group as well, but that may not tell us much about the potentials of the group. In other words, it is worthwhile to analyze the core group with two basic geographical criteria combined - origin and the focus of research. For example, in such case, a person coming from Italy and doing a research on Czech Republic would be counted as geographically and for the purposes of the initiative relevant for Czech Republic; on the contrary, person from Czech Republic conducting research on a general topic or on another non-CEE/SEE country would be counted as relevant for Czech Republic again (because of linguistic skills, etc). To avoid double counting, if a person is coming from the region and doing a research on the region, she is counted only once in accordance with her research and not origin (having in mind that origin is only of secondary importance for one's expertise on the region). Such a combined list of the core group looks as follows:



**Table 10 - Geographical Focus of Research and Origin of the Core Group Researchers**

<b>EUI (core group)</b>	
<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of times it appears in PhD projects or as a country of origin of a researcher</b>
Bulgaria	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2
Central Eastern Europe	1
Croatia	4
Czech Republic	1
Hungary	1
Kosovo	1
Lithuania	1
Macedonia	1
Poland	6
Russia	1
Serbia	6
Slovenia	1
Turkey	2

When these two determinants are combined, some patterns do occur. For example, former Yugoslav republics have by far the highest share (they appear 15 times). In contrast, former USSR countries and Turkey appear only 2 times each. The next large group is Poland (with 6 times), and Serbia with equal number of appearances. Furthermore, it seems that these 22 people cover a rather vast array of countries, although some of them are not represented (these are Albania, Romania, Slovakia, Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus, Latvia and Estonia).

Interim conclusions:

1. In both LAW and ECO department the CEE/SEE region is under-researched. There are only two researchers in the law department that use a CEE/SEE country as a case study, but there may be more of them that have remained undiscovered in the process of data collection.
2. Conversely, there is a lot of research done on CEE/SEE countries in the SPS and HEC departments. Nevertheless, there are considerable differences between these two departments geographically speaking. In the SPS department, the region that is mostly researched is former Yugoslavia. In the HEC department, the research is most often done on former USSR countries.
3. Researchers from the core group, which expressed their interest in the initiative, mostly deal with former Yugoslav republics. This conclusion is much stronger when criteria of origin and the focus of research are combined.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

Let us briefly summarize the conclusions made so far and then proceed to make recommendations.

The first part of the report deals with the analysis of subject fields covered by people coming from or working on the CEE/SEE region. In the LAW department, there is almost no focus on CEE/SEE or its authoritarian past. Most of LAW researchers relevant for the EGE initiative deal with economic issues, in particular with intervention of the state in the market. There is a lot of expertise in the LAW department in EU law and therefore also in issues pertaining to the process of accession to the EU. In ECO department, there is almost no research on CEE/SEE, and only one researcher investigates 'emerging market economies'. In the SPS department there are great potentials for research on CEE/SEE, because many researchers explore such topics in their PhD projects. Dominant theme is economic and institutional transformation of CEE/SEE countries, where a cluster of researchers deals with institution-building and another cluster works on policy change, in particular with regard to social policies. There is a significant group in the SPS department working on citizenship and migration. In the HEC department there are a lot of researchers dealing with CEE/SEE. There are two relevant groups within this department. The first comprises those who work on recent authoritarian/communist period, within which the dominant themes are history of art and its connection with broader social processes, multicultural issues, international relations etc. The second group of researchers in HEC deals with a more distant past, where some of the substantive fields are history of art, multiculturalism, social rights, institutional change etc.

The report tries to detect some of the overlapping areas which can serve as a basis for establishment of inter-departmental links. The conclusion is that there are some topics that researchers from different departments have in common, but not all of them would attract researchers from each of the EUI's four departments. Most potential lies in cooperation in the field of economic transformation and relationship between free-market and welfare state values. This topic could be of potential interest for researchers from all departments. Another possible subject field would be institutional change put into the perspective of Europeanization, but research in that area would probably not have a good response in ECO department. There is some interest for research on citizenship, migration, inter-cultural relations and religion, but it is doubtful whether these issues would gain enough momentum in all departments.

Further to this, the report explored what use can be made of the core group of researchers that expressed an immediate interest in the initiative. The analysis has shown that there is much more response to the initiative in LAW and SPS departments, than in ECO and HEC. Although there are some common points of interest between these researchers, which mostly overlap with previously mentioned topics at the level of the EUI as a whole, the number of researchers in each subject field is not high enough to form well-rounded research teams on relevant topics. The core group should hence be utilized as an impetus for future cooperation and not as a full-blown research group.

The second part of the report explores geographical dispersion of relevant researchers by their origin and focus of their research. The conclusion is that there is a great diversity among 91 researchers selected for the analysis. However, there are still some countries of CEE/SEE that are not represented at the EUI (Moldova, Albania, Kosovo, Slovakia and Czech Republic). Furthermore, in all but SPS department researchers from Poland are dominant in numbers. On the level of the EUI as a whole, there are some significant clusters of researchers that could have potential for research on a specific sub-region or a country. These are former Soviet Union countries, former Yugoslav republics, Turkey and Poland. Nevertheless, when the core group of researchers is analyzed separately, only researchers from former Yugoslavia and Poland seem interested in the initiative at this stage.

The examination of geographical focus of the research has shown that there are only a few researchers in LAW department using some CEE/SEE countries as case studies and none in the ECO department.

Although there is a lot of research on the region in SPS and HEC departments, there are considerable differences between them: in the SPS department the most researched sub-region is former Yugoslavia, and in HEC department it is the former USSR. Researchers from the core group mostly deal with former Yugoslavia, which is even more significant when criteria of their research focus and origin are combined.

Finally, let us make some tentative recommendations for future activities of the EGE initiative:

1. Should the initiative proceed as a subject-field related project, most potential lies in exploring topics of economic transformation and institutional change.
2. If there is a need to geographically limit the project, then former Yugoslav countries present the most promising area for research.
3. There is a clear need for reflection on the existing cooperation between researchers from different departments and evaluation of possibilities for inter-departmental cross fertilization in research on CEE/SEE region. This could be done through re-establishing the existing working group at the SPS department that could include researchers from other departments as well, or by organizing a workshop on a subject field that is relevant to the highest number of researchers.
4. The potential of the EGE initiative is steadily growing and a lot of feedback has been received from researchers wanting to join. This enthusiasm needs a response on the part of the EUI as to match the expectations of researchers. This could be done through institutionalization of the initiative.
5. Even though there is a great potential for research on CEE/SEE within the EUI, some external partnerships should be established. This is because not all relevant questions pertaining to CEE/SEE are covered within the EUI, and the initiative needs both external cooperation for evaluation purposes (to assess how relevant is the direction in which it is going) and research purposes (to cover relevant subject fields that are under-researched at the EUI). This can be done on both personal basis and institutional level.



